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## Ranking Rubric and Evaluation Form

**Grant Application for Student Academic Conference Support**

Title of Presentation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Name of Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: After reviewing the grant application, please rate it using the criteria below. Circle the number on the scale that best describes your judgment on each criterion.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating scale: | 1 = Strongly disagree2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree or disagree | 4 = Agree5 = Strongly agree  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Scale** |
| 1. The research to be presented is well-defined and rigorous. The aims, methodology, results and contributions of the work are clearly explained in the abstract. Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| 2. The conference which has accepted the work for presentation is an appropriate venue. The quality of academic dialogue can be expected to be high. Comments:  | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| 3. The acceptance communication from the conference organizers is professional and reflects a high level of satisfaction with the quality of the student's submission. Comments:  | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| 4. The letter from the faculty mentor reflects strong support for the student's work and its presentation at the conference. Comments:  | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| 5. The budget request is clearly described and appropriate.Comments:  | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| 6. The presentation at the conference will foster a deepening of a culture of inquiry at Lewis University. Comments:  | 1 2 3 4 5  |
| SUM OF POINTS  | \_\_\_\_\_\_/30\_  |
| Other Comments  |   |
|    |   |

What is your overall recommendation?
\_\_\_\_\_\_ Approve

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Approve, pending additional information or clarification

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Do not approve